

## **REMARKS**

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated April 18, 2007. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 13-18, 21-30, and 32 are now present in this case. Claim 1, 9, 17, and 25 are amended.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 13-18, 21-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,700,888 to Jonsson et al. combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,680,921 to Svanbro et al. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. In a telephone conference with the Examiner on April 26, 2006, the Examiner recommended providing greater detail enumerating portions of that are considered to be relevant. Claim 32 was previously amended to include such detail. Claim 1 is presently amended to include such detail. It should be noted that neither Jonsson nor Svanbro, taken alone or in combination, suggest any process in which relevant portions are compressed wherein the relevant portions comprise a source internet protocol (IP) address, a destination IP address, a source port, a destination port, a sequence number, a time stamp, and a payload type header field such that the base station transfers less than the entire header to the remote unit. It is clearly shown in Figure 3 of Svanbro, the entire header is, in fact, transmitted to the remote unit. Svanbro merely separates the header so that the time stamp is processed separately, but recombines the conventional header compression output (302) and the time stamp compression output (301) to form the compressed header 22 (see column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 13). Jonsson also fails to disclose any system in which less than the entire header is transmitted. The technique disclosed in Jonsson compresses the header in a manner that violates the data integrity of the header but nonetheless transmits the entire header (albeit in compressed form). Thus, neither reference suggests transmitting less than the entire header.

In the Office Action, at pages 8-9, the Examiner asserts that Svanbro discloses compression techniques in which less than the entire header is transferred to a remote unit. However, the cited section of Svanbro asserts no such thing. In column 1, line 11 – column 2, line 41, cited by the Examiner as supporting such an assertion, Svanbro merely talks about the loss of time context if a data packet is

dropped. In the prior art, subsequent data packets would also be dropped due to lack of time context until a “full (uncompressed) header” is transmitted. (See column 1, lines 41-42.) However, the term “full header” as used by Svanbro refers to an uncompressed header. It does not teach or suggest that certain data fields from the header are not transmitted, as recited in the present claims. Thus, none of the references suggest a header compressor that compresses relevant portions comprising the specific data fields recited in Claims 1 and 32. For at least this reason, Claims 1 and 32 are clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Svanbro. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from Claim 1, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 7 is directed to a transmission network in which a header compressor compresses only relevant portions of the extracted header comprising a payload type header field wherein the base station transfers the payload to a remote unit and does not transfer the entire header to the remote unit.” As discussed above, both Jonsson and Svanbro disclose techniques in which the entire header, albeit in compressed form, is transferred to the remote unit. Jonsson accomplishes the compression by violating data integrity (see column 2, lines 31-39) while Svanbro compresses all data fields. Svanbro merely compresses the time stamp in a different manner, but clearly shows that the time stamp and all other data fields are compressed by blocks 301-302 in Figure 3 and combined to form the compressed header 22. Thus, the combination of references do not suggest transferring less than the entire header to the remote unit. Accordingly, Claim 7 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Svanbro.

Claim 9 is a method claim that recites inter alia “compression only relevant portions of the extracted header, the relevant portions comprising a payload type header field” as well as transferring the payload and “not transferring all header fields from the base to the remote unit.” As discussed above, neither Jonsson nor Svanbro taken alone or in combination, suggest compressing a payload type header field and not transferring all header fields from the base to the remote unit, as recited in Claim 9. Accordingly, Claim 9 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Svanbro.

Claims 10, and 13-16 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from Claim 9, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 17 is directed to a machine-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of executable instructions comprising instructions to inter alia “compress only relevant portions of the extracted header, the relevant portions comprising a payload type header field” as well as to “transfer the payload and only the compressed relevant portions of the header, less than all header fields, to a remote unit.” As discussed above with respect to Claim 9, the combination of Jonsson and Svanbro do not teach or suggest compressing a payload type header field as a relevant portion of the extracted header. Furthermore, neither reference teaches or suggests transferring the payload and only the compressed relevant portions of the header, less than all header fields, to a remote unit, as recited in Claim 17. As noted above, Jonsson transmits all header fields, but violates the integrity of the header fields in order to achieve a compression effect. Svanbro also transmits all header fields and merely separates the time stamp portion for separate compression and processing. However, as clearly shown in Figure 3, all the header fields are compressed by either the process 301 or the process 302 and combined form a compressed header 22. Nothing in the combination of these references suggests transmitting less than all header fields. Accordingly, Claim 17 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Svanbro. Claim 18 and Claims 21-24 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from Claim 17 and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 25 is directed to a call processing method in which only relevant portions of the extracted header and payload are extracted with the “relevant portions comprising a payload type header field and transmitting only the relevant portions of the extracted header, less than all header fields, and the payload to a remote unit. As discussed above, the combination of Jonsson and Svanbro do not suggest extracting a relevant portion of the header comprising payload type header field. Furthermore, the combination of references do not teach or suggest transmitting only the relevant portions of the extracted header, less than all header fields, to the remote unit. Accordingly, Claim 25 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and

Svanbro. Claims 26-30 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from Claim 25, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicants have made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 757-8029.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alok K. Saxena et al.  
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

/Michael J. Donohue, Reg. #35859/  
Michael J. Donohue

MJD:gatc

1201 Third Avenue  
Suite 2200  
Phone: (206) 757-8029  
Fax: (206) 757-7029

2038819\_1.DOC